

### Risk Log - Attachment Submissions – D

Risks / Mitigations	
---------------------	--

Bids should set out their position on both the feasibility and risks together with risk mitigation related to their proposal. Within that document, Bidders are required to set out their hierarchy of risks and their proposed mitigations.

For the avoidance of doubt, it is the understanding of the risks to your proposal and crucially your mitigation proposals that is being evaluated. Avoiding addressing risks will score lower marks in the evaluation.

The Authority and its evaluators are seeking to assess the depth of understanding of the Bidder - and their mitigation strategy. A very good response will be one that is clear about the significant challenges and therefore risks of TLIF but proposes mitigations which are comprehensive and robust and which will be likely to address and surmount the risks. (Generic risks which may occur in any project or program will receive a lower score).

A maximum of 12 risks should be submitted - beyond this total of 12 no others will be evaluated.

	Description of Risk	Type of Risk	Impact	Severity	Links to other projects and/or business areas	Mitigation	Notes - not more than 50 words per Risk
	Provide a brief description of the risk (a problem which you foresee occurring).  <u>Highest impact risks should be placed at the top of the list</u>	Please give a brief description of the risk - for example: people, process, system, financial, legal etc.	What will happen if the risk becomes live and turns into an issue - for example if a risk were an overflowing bath then the impact would be a flood to the house which may result in other events such as making the house uninhabitable resulting in significant cost and disruption	<u>What is the significance of the risk both to to your proposal and TLIF - including Time / Cost / Quality?</u>  Bidders should state the severity in terms of High / Medium / Low	Are there any relevant dependencies?	Describe your planned mitigation approach - using the example from the Impact column, a mitigation of calling a plumber after the event would be poor. The Authority is seeking the actions and skills the Bidder will bring to TLIF to address the risks - which may be: people, process, systems, resources, assets and IP etc.	This is for the Bidders to complete - this may be blank or may be a quantification or qualification of the risk.
1	Delay in awarding TLIF contract due to general election	Legal, Financial, Process, People	TLIF programme cancelled or timescale slips back - Possibility that would not be able to deliver bid volume projections in bid timescales	Severity is <b>HIGH: Time</b> - late start of programme would slip delivery as unable to complete set up phase before Dec 18 . <b>Cost</b> would be neutral or reduced as total number of networks would not be achieved in existing timeframe of March 2020. <b>Quality</b> - No impact	Advisors and management team members may be unavailable if other projects arise before TLIF begins	We will look to accelerate the Communications campaign and shorten the timescale (where possible) of schools that express an interest to starting the programme. Networks could be increased to 6 schools instead of 4 where demand in an area is high. This would enable the volume of participants to be maintained and keep within the price envelope.	<b>Time</b> We have introduced additional resources for some tasks so although using the same amount of days we have shortened the timescale for delivery to complete design work. The delay in communications is harder to analyse - see Risk 2 and 3. <b>Cost</b> would be neutral or reduced for resources, marketing campaigns will need to be redeveloped. <b>Quality</b> No impact
2	Delay in TLIF contract start prevents communications with schools prior to the summer break	Communications, Process	Schools are not aware of the TLIF programme and being signed up ready for the start of Networks 1- 3 - Roll out of Networks is delayed	Severity is <b>HIGH: Time</b> - late start of Networks would delay roll out of programme . <b>Cost</b> would be neutral or reduced as total number of networks may not be achieved in existing timeframe of March 2020, <b>Quality</b> - No impact	Loss of some advisors to other projects if networks unavailable	With the approval of the Authority we would contact NAPT members and local authorities in the Opportunity and Priority areas ahead of contract commencement to obtain expressions of interest and awareness of the programme. The slipping of Networks 1-3 by two months, whilst not desirable, would allow sufficient communication time before starting.	<b>TIME</b> The late award of contract has removed the opportunity to engage with schools before the end of the academic year and put our start date at risk. We are still aiming to have the first network to commence at the end of October after the 1/2term break subject to being able to recruit sufficient schools in the timeframe. If we are unable to recruit the in time for October then then we would delay the whole programme by one month. We would request that the Milestone date for this is not included as a KPI or is not subject to a service
3	Insufficient Priority schools recruited in location to build viable networks	Process, Financial	Network does not have sufficient priority schools to be effective	Severity is <b>HIGH: Time</b> - A window of a term exists for additional schools to join and catch up but if not the network would have to run under strength . <b>Cost</b> would be reduced as total number of schools/participants would not be achieved in the network. <b>Quality</b> would be reduced for participants as although they would be engaged in peer to peer activities reduced participant numbers would reduce the effectiveness of the network.	None	In such circumstances we may, in agreement with the Authority, slip a start date by a month if additional school(s) have indicated a strong commitment to join. Alternatively a non- priority school could be offered a place to fill the gap at an appropriate rate. This would not be charged to the Authority.	
4	Schools drop out of programme due to forced academisation, notice of being at risk of classified coasting or adverse OFSTED judgement	Process - Financial	Network loses a school(s) and effectiveness	Severity is <b>HIGH: Time</b> - A window of a term exists for additional schools to join and catch up but if not the network would have to run under strength . <b>Cost</b> would be reduced as total number of schools/participants would not be achieved in the network. <b>Quality</b> would be reduced for participants as although they would be engaged in peer to peer activities reduced participant numbers would reduce the effectiveness of the network.	None	Depending on how far the Network is into the programme we would ask the relevant RSC, LA, Trust /Sponsor to allow the school to continue as long as is possible to sustain the effectiveness of the Network. If this support was not forthcoming and assuming we were within a term window of the start date we would recruit another priority school or as above an alternative non-priority school without charge to the Authority	
5	Over subscription of schools in locations with existing networks	Process	Schools cannot join a network and do not benefit from the programme	Severity is <b>HIGH: Time</b> -Schools would be unable to benefit immediately and over subscription towards the end of the contract would mean them missing the programme. <b>Cost</b> There is no impact to cost . <b>Quality: The overall impact of the TLIF programme</b> would be reduced as not every school wishing to join may be accommodated	None	If this happens near the beginning of the contract we would inform the schools that we will be starting another network and that they will be able to join that. If this happens towards the end of the contract we can increase the number of schools in a network to a maximum of 8. We would expect to be able to identify such situations early and discuss with the Authority about reviewing the roll out schedule where required to prevent schools missing out.	If this situation arises we hope the Authority would review the roll out schedule so we do not turn schools away there is no overall cost impact although it would have to remain in budget year.
	Schools do not release staff for network days or coherent agenda of activities on development days	Process - People	Participants in the programme do not get the benefits of the full programme. Overall achievement of aims is missed. Provider and Authority reputational risk due to reduced impact/success of programme .	Severity is <b>Medium: Time</b> - We would endeavour to catch participants up by making available materials where possible. <b>Cost</b> . There would be no impact on costs. <b>Quality</b> would be reduced for participants as they would miss modules and peer to peer activities. Overall impact to individual and school performance and the effectiveness of the network.	None	For all schools joining our programmes we make clear to the leadership team and governing body that there is a requirement and a commitment to releasing staff to maximise their participation in the programme. We recognise that in exceptional circumstances staff may be prevented from joining a network or development day and we would look to 'catch up' the individual via email or at the next planned meeting. We try and schedule events with schools to coincide with appropriate times and days to minimise any classroom disruption.	As we are offering the programme at nil cost to the school we would suggest that any budget that they had set aside for CPD could be considered for additional cover in exceptional circumstances, ie in small schools where capacity is an issue.
6	Very high levels of staff turnover disrupt continuity	People	Participants in the programme do not get the benefits of the full programme. Overall achievement of aims is missed. Provider and Authority reputational risk due to reduced impact/success of programme .	Severity is <b>Medium: Time</b> - We would endeavour to catch new participants up by making available materials where possible. <b>Cost</b> . There would be no impact on costs as we work on a whole school concept. <b>Quality</b> would be reduced for new participants as they would have to catch up. Overall impact to individual and school performance and the effectiveness of the network.	None	During the sign up process we will work with schools and their governing bodies to identify where there is high staff turnover. If it is known that a number of changes are due to happen we would suggest that the school either joins a later network in their area or if there is not another network starting we look at a shortened delivery ( as in Risk 5) as a last resort.	
7	Insufficient trained advisors available to deliver programme	People	Unable to deliver programme due to insufficient staff	Severity is <b>Medium: Time</b> - Insufficient trained staff to deliver programme causes delays to start and roll out. . <b>Cost</b> . Reduced contract income as delivery not completed. <b>Quality</b> - Advisors deployed are over worked and quality of delivery and programmes is diminished.	Staff may need to be taken from other contracts which reduces overall business effectiveness and quality.	We have designed a programme that builds on our existing IP and resources. All of our Advisors and associates are trained in these elements of the programme. A ramp up of the the delivery of the programme will allow sufficient time for additional training on the specifics of the TLIF programme	Although we have rated the severity of this risk as medium the probability of it happening is very low .
8	Insufficient capacity to meet BSI ISO 9001 requirements which support the programme	People, Process	Unable to maintain high level of quality within the programme	Severity is <b>Medium: Time</b> - Insufficient staff to undertake quality assurance visits, customer survey(s) and timely reviews results in nonconformities within the quality management system. <b>Cost</b> . no direct impact to costs. <b>Quality</b> - Quality of delivery and programmes is diminished and nonconformities may put the BSI ISO 9001 accreditation at risk.	None	The company has maintained the BSI ISO 9001 accreditation for 10 years and prides itself on the rigor of the quality management system. In addition to the external accreditation undertaken by BSI, internal audits of all aspects of the quality management system take place to ensure that a high standard of the quality management system is maintained.	Although we have rated the severity of this risk as medium the probability of it happening is very low.
9	Revised course materials not prepared in time	Process	Unable to deliver programme due to course materials	Severity is <b>Low: Time</b> - programme could start using existing IP and materials. <b>Cost</b> . No direct impact to costs. <b>Quality</b> Programmes would not reflect the TLIF context and delivery of the programmes is diminished.	None	We have designed a programme that builds on our existing IP and resources so it is a rework of the context of TLIF and rebranding which can be completed very easily in house.	
10	Unavailability of suitable venues for network events	Process	Poor quality venues create poor perception of programme	Severity is <b>Low: Time</b> - programme could start on time in suitable alternative venues. <b>Cost</b> . No direct impact to costs although subsequent reduction through service credits if venues unsuitable. <b>Quality</b> Poor venues would impact on the effectiveness of the network events and the context and delivery of the programmes is diminished.	None	We have an extensive list of venues that we use throughout the country and are confident that we have enough venues that will accommodate our requirements	